

REMARKS

Claims 1–33 are pending in the application.

Claims 1–3, 5, 8-12, 14, 17-21, 23, 26 and 27 stand rejected.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 13, 15, 16, 22, 24 and 25 stand objected.

Claims 28-33 have been added.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 9-12, 18-21 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Natarajan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,304,546.

The cited portions of Natarajan teach a frame relay network (element 120 of FIG. 1 of Natarajan) in which a first local router (element 112 in FIG. 1) is coupled to a first node (element 110 of FIG. 1) by a first local communication link (element 111 in FIG. 1). Natarajan, col. 2, lines 42-45. The cited portions of Natarajan fail to teach or suggest “coupling one or more modified frame relay sub-interface entities internal to at least one network router with one or more corresponding data link layer entities internal to at least one unit under test”, as recited in claim 1. Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, as arranged in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984). No modified frame relay sub-interface entities internal to at least one network router are disclosed in the cited portions of Natarajan, nor does Natarajan suggest coupling such modified frame relay sub-interface entities to data link layer entities internal to at least one unit under test. Since the cited art fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 102(e) rejection. The withdrawal of the 102(e) rejection of claims 2-3, 9-12, 18-21, and 27 is requested for similar reasons.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5, 14 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natarajan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,304,546, in view of Lemler et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,546,420. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection for at least the same reasons as those provided above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 8, 17 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natarajan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,304,546, in view of Sadjadi ("CTE Announces World's First Frame Relay Data Communication Device with Compression, Encryption, and T1/E1 Features"). Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection for at least the same reasons as those provided above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Additionally, Applicant notes that, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974), *see also* MPEP § 2143.03. As noted in the rejection, "Natarajan fail [sic] to teach at least one or more modified frame relay sub-interface entities logically coupled with at least one decryption-encryption service." Office Action, p. 3. The cited portions of Sadjadi states: "The WANGUARD (TM) Encryption System will have automatic or programable [sic] key management to provide for identification, authentication, and certification of data. CCC/CTE's System Network Management (SNMP) feature will allow network managers to monitor[,] configure and control the devices which will enable client security personnel to implement their organizations [sic] security policy on their networks. CCC/CTE is unaware of any other entity in the world which combines compression and encryption over frame relay networks at T1/E1 input speeds." Sadjadi, paragraph 1, p. 2. This statement, both alone and in combination with the cited portions of Natarajan, clearly fails to teach or suggest "coupling at least one of the one or more modified frame relay sub-interface entities with at least one decryption-encryption service", as recited in claim 8. Since the references, both alone and in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the

claim limitations in claim 8, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection. The withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17 and 26 is requested for similar reasons.

Allowable Claims

Claims 4, 6, 7, 13, 15, 16, 22, 24, and 25 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant believes that these claims are allowable over the cited art by virtue of being dependent on allowable base claims. Additionally, new claims 28-33 correspond to claims 4, 6, 7, 13, 15, and 16 respectively, and thus Applicant believes these claims are allowable. Applicant will rewrite claims 22, 24, and 25 in independent form at a later time if necessary. X

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5080. X

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 14, 2003.

Brenna A. Brock

Attorney for Applicant(s)

11-14-2003

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Brenna A. Brock

Brenna A. Brock

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 48,509

(512) 439-5080 [Phone]

(512) 439-5099 [Fax]